

<b>Record # 1</b>	(b)(6)	<b>Consumer Sentinel Network Complaint</b>	
<b>Reference Number:</b>	(b)(6)	<b>Originator Reference Number:</b>	
<b>Language:</b>	English	<b>Contact Type:</b>	Complaint
<b>Source:</b>	Consumer	<b>DNC?:</b>	No
<b>Comments:</b>	<p>(b)(6) is violating antitrust laws, preventing me from working as a physician, along with reprimanding other physicians, and reprimanding other physicians for providing FDA-approved excellent medical care. The medical board reprimanded me to the judge for reporting patient harm at (b)(6). The medical board also committed six counts of fraud v (b)(6) providing good medical care. although I have more medical training and publications in PubMed than some of them, they claimed that there was no evidence of my competency. several physicians verified my competency. I work at (b)(6) please see (b)(6) here is a case where the medical board attempted to reprimand this physician for excellent medical care. If medical boards are reprimanding, or trying to reprimand "by the books," "simple," "non-abstruse," "FDA-approved," medical care, then one might ask the following questions 1. Do we need doctors to serve on the medical board 2. Why don't the doctors on the medical board perform their due diligence 3. Is absolute immunity of medical board members helping board members, or patients? (b)(6) We also rank very high in rates of fraud and misconduct committed by medical boards. We need legislative advocacy. According to the medical board, every medical student in the state is practicing medicine without a license when they form a "diagnosis," after seeing the patient. Laws need to state that clinical diagnosis of practicing without a license is when the diagnosis of another physician is rendered not as an opinion, but as a the diagnosis that is informed to the patient and presented as such, and without commentary by the physician who is the patient's provider. These are the things that medical boards are engaging in and you never know when an administrator will give you bad evals for asking them a single question, and when they will equivocate an honest reply with blaming. Would it surprise you that the medical board (b)(6) (and they probably aren't alone,) committed six counts of fraud trying to reprimand (b)(6) (b)(6) for GOOD medical care. These physicians on the medical board didn't spend one hour looking up the stent guidelines, not did they simply call (b)(6) and say, "hey, can you explain the case to me." The Unaccountable medical board attorneys are encouraged by tv unaccountable medical board members to win, apparently to ignore patient harm, even if it occurred repeatedly. The VA Scandal is not limited to the VA, but could occur in any hospital in the USA. We need to reform medical boards somewhat. You may mock, (b)(6) isn't alone, TX appears* to be engaged in abuse of discretion. (b)(6) The judge said that the Board of Registration for (b)(6) conduct was "unfathomable and deeply disturbing." The AMA currently opposes the FTC in their effort v the NC dental board. They say that patient safety is the reason, but it appears to be to abuse discretion. Yes, patient harm is significant, but boards capriciously evaluate physicians moral character. For example, a resident beat the sh!+ out of someone, was arrested, and taken to jail, has a mug shot online. The resident is of good moral character with board... (b)(6)</p>		
<b>Complaint disposition provided?:</b>			

<b>Complaint Disposition:</b>			
<b>Data Reference:</b>		<b>Load Date:</b>	07/24/2014 6:39:03 PM
<b>Created By:</b>	FTCCIS-FTCUSER	<b>Created Date:</b>	07/24/2014 6:39:03 PM
<b>Updated By:</b>		<b>Updated Date:</b>	
<b>Complaint Source:</b>	FTC Mobile Complaint Assistant	<b>Product Service Description:</b>	Franchises\ Distributorships
<b>Amount Requested:</b>		<b>Amount Paid:</b>	\$1,000.00
<b>Payment Method:</b>	Check	<b>Agency Contact:</b>	Mobile
<b>Complaint Date:</b>	07/24/2014	<b>Transaction Date:</b>	08/01/2013
<b>Initial Contact:</b>	Mail	<b>Initial Response:</b>	
<b>Statute/Rule:</b>	FTC Act Sec 5 (BCP)	<b>Law Violation:</b>	Deception/Misrepresentation
<b>Topic:</b>		<b>Dispute with Credit Bureau?:</b>	
<b>Dispute with Credit Bureau - Responded?:</b>		<b>Dispute with Credit Bureau - Resolved to Satisfaction?:</b>	
<b>Member of armed forces or dependent?:</b>	No	<b>Cross Border Complaint?:</b>	No
<b>Consumer Information</b>			
<b>Consumer Small Business or Organization:</b>			
<b>First Name:</b>	(b)(6)	<b>Last Name:</b>	(b)(6)
<b>Address 1:</b>	(b)(6)	<b>Address 2:</b>	(b)(6)
<b>City:</b>	(b)(6)	<b>State:</b>	(b)(6)
<b>Zip:</b>	(b)(6)	<b>Country:</b>	UNITED STATES
<b>Home Number:</b>	(b)(6)	<b>Cell Number:</b>	(b)(6)
<b>Work Number:</b>	(b)(6)	<b>Ext:</b>	(b)(6)
<b>Fax Number:</b>	(b)(6)	<b>Email:</b>	(b)(6)

<b>Age Range:</b>	30 - 39	<b>Military Service Branch:</b>	
<b>Soldier Status:</b>		<b>Soldier Station:</b>	
<b>Subject</b>			
<b>Subject:</b>	(b)(6)	<b>Normalized Name:</b>	(b)(6)
<b>Address 1:</b>	(b)(6)	<b>Address 2:</b>	
<b>City:</b>	(b)(6)	<b>State/Prov:</b>	(b)(6)
<b>ZIP:</b>	(b)(6)	<b>Country:</b>	UNITED STATES
<b>Email:</b>		<b>URL:</b>	
<b>Phone Number:</b>		<b>Ext:</b>	
<b>Subject ID Type:</b>		<b>Subject ID Issuer State:</b>	
<b>Subject ID Issuer Country:</b>			
<b>Representative Name:</b>	(b)(6)	<b>Title:</b>	(b)(6)
<b>Associated Subject</b>			
<b>Company:</b>	(b)(6)	<b>Normalized Company:</b>	(b)(6)
<b>Company Type:</b>	Other	<b>Address:</b>	(b)(6)
<b>City:</b>	(b)(6)	<b>State/Prov:</b>	(b)(6)
<b>ZIP:</b>	(b)(6)	<b>Country:</b>	UNITED STATES
<b>Email:</b>		<b>URL:</b>	
<b>Phone Number:</b>		<b>Ext:</b>	